

Remarks

Claims 1 – 32 are pending. Claims 1 – 32 are rejected. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request allowance of claims 1 – 32.

Claims 1 – 3, 5 and 24 – 26 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Connolly et al (5,325,419).

Claim 1 requires:

“A method of operating a service control point, the method comprising:

- receiving a call set-up message into the service control point for an incoming call;
- processing the call set-up message to identify a wireless communication interface;
- generating an alert message indicating the incoming call and caller information from the call set-up message;
- transmitting the alert message from the service control point to the wireless communication interface;
- receiving a response message into the service control point wherein the response message indicates a destination communication device to receive the incoming call;
- processing the response message to generate a routing instruction that connects the incoming call to the destination communication device; and
- transmitting the routing instruction from the service control point.”

As shown above, claim 1 requires both a wireless communication interface and a destination communication device. These are two different devices. Figure 2 shows the two devices as the wireless communication interfaces (210) and the destination communication device (260). Figure 4 shows the two devices as a cell phone (416) and a fax machine (460). In operation the SCP alerts the first device (i.e. the wireless communication device, the cell phone, or the like) to the incoming call. The first device

sends a message telling the SCP to send the incoming call to the second device (i.e. the destination communication device, the fax machine, or the like). In this way, the first device can redirect the incoming call to another device that has the proper functionality to receive the incoming call. Connolly does not have a first device that sends a message to the SCP that causes the SCP to redirect the incoming call to a second device. Figure 11 and the descriptive text are a "time sequence diagrammatic flowchart illustrating an incoming call to an intelligent portable handset terminal" (column 31, lines 4 – 6). The sequence of messages shown in figure 11 between the SCP and the portable handset end up with the incoming call connected to the portable handset (see column 34, lines 4 – 5) not to a second device.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed Cir. 1987). Here, the cited art does not teach having a first device redirect an incoming call to a second device, therefore the cited prior art does not fulfilled the requirements for a *prima facie* case of anticipation. Therefore claim 1 is allowable as written.

Claims 2 – 7 are dependent on allowable claim 1 and are therefore allowable.

The arguments for claim 1 (above) apply to claim 24. Therefore claim 24 is allowable.

Claims 25 and 26 are dependent on allowable claim 24 and are therefore allowable.

Claims 8 – 10, 12, 15 – 17, 19 and 22 – 23 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Connolly et al (5,325,419) in view of Torba et al (6,563,788).

Nether Connolly nor Torba teach having a first device redirect an incoming call to a second device. Therefore the arguments for claim 1 (above) apply to claim 8 and claim 8 is allowable as written.

Claims 9 – 14 are dependent on allowable claim 8 and are therefore allowable.

The arguments for claim 8 (above) apply to claim 15. Therefore claim 15 is allowable.

Claims 15 – 23 are dependent on allowable claim 15 and are therefore allowable.

Claims 27 – 29 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Connolly et al (5,325,419) in view of Criss et al (6,643,506).

Nether Connolly nor Criss teach having a first device redirect an incoming call to a second device. Therefore the arguments for claim 1 (above) apply to claim 27 and claim 27 is allowable as written.

Claims 28 and 29 are dependent on allowable claim 27 and are therefore allowable.

Claims 30 – 32 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Connolly et al (5,325,419) in view of Janow et al (6,061,570).

Nether Connolly nor Janow teach having a first device redirect an incoming call to a second device. Therefore the arguments for claim 1 (above) apply to claim 30 and claim 30 is allowable as written.

Claims 318 and 32 are dependent on allowable claim 30 and are therefore allowable.

Applicants submit that there are numerous additional reasons in support of patentability, but that such reasons are moot in light of the above remarks and are omitted in the interests of brevity. Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 1 – 32.



SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Steven L. Webb, Reg. No. 44,395
Duft Setter Ollila & Bornsen LLC
Telephone: (303) 938-9999 ext. 22
Facsimile: (303) 938-9995

Correspondence address:**CUSTOMER NO. 28004**

Attn: Harley R. Ball
6391 Sprint Parkway
Mailstop: KSOPHT0101-Z2100
Overland Park, KS 66251-2100